



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# JOURNAL OF MYCOLOGY

*A Periodical Devoted to North American Mycology. Issued Bimonthly; January, March, May, July, September and November. Price, \$2.00 per Year. To Foreign Subscribers \$2.25. Edited and Published by*  
*W. A. KELLERMAN, PH. D., COLUMBUS, OHIO.*

---

## EDITOR'S NOTES.

In a Paris letter of July last Mr. C. G. Lloyd says: "There has been so much changing of names lately in the Polyporii that we feel it well to state our position in this regard. The most and best systematic work on Polyporus was done by Fries. His system and names have been in use for two generations, and are familiar to all. We therefore feel that no attempt should be made to change them, except in very exceptional cases. . . . As to the genera, the question is not so simple. The genus Polyporus is too large and should be broken up, but I feel that as much of the old should be retained as possible, particularly the four leading sections with which we are all familiar." I need not add that Mr. Lloyd condemns very emphatically the work that has been done the last few years in making new genera of polyporoids. In fact we must admit that at the hands of a number of competent mycologists the work here alluded to has not found favor.

---

We quote the above and allude to the situation there commented upon, to emphasize the difference that obtains between that case and the one presented by such work as is outlined in the review in the first part of this No. of the Journal. To Dr. Arthur's scheme it is expected that some, possibly many, will object; for here too is "a vast array of new names." When we read "Pyropolyporus," "Ganoderma," "Coriolus," we get no new idea, at least no new information is suggested. But when we are presented with "Uredinatae," "Pucciniastratae," "Chrysomyxatae," "Cronartiatae," we must form a new conception, and look from a new point of view. So also the "vast array" of new genera or new meaning in old genera, as "Cronartium," "Cerotelium," "Cionothrix," "Alveolaria," "Baeodromus," "Endophyllum," and "Puccinosira," stand in each case for advanced views based on advanced knowledge and new valuations.

---